

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 8, 31, and 39 are amended. Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27-33, and 35-39 are pending in this application.

35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, 13-16, 25, 27, 31-32, and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,313 to Hou et al. (hereinafter "Hou") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,081,829 to Sidana (hereinafter "Sidana"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 13-16, 25, 27, 31-32, and 37-39 are not obvious over Hou in view of Sidana.

Hou discloses a multimedia-based reporting system that allows drawing, text, and audio recording annotations to be added to the report (see, col. 2, lines 40-61, and col. 6, lines 52-66). The reporting system of Hou includes an annotation input interpreter that provides an interface between the user annotation input and three types of annotation handlers that can add annotations to a "canvas" of the report: a static annotation handler, a dynamic annotation handler, and an annotation on annotation handler (see, Fig. 9, and col. 6, lines 25-29). The reporting system of Hou also includes a mail report handler that allows the user to select a receiver's name and the report to be sent to the receiver via an e-mail system (see, col. 3, lines 8-13, and col. 4, lines 26-31). Hou further discloses that the annotation on annotation handler allows a user to select a desired segment of an annotation and make a new annotation which is a reply to this selected segment (see, col. 9, lines 14-24).

Sidana is directed to general purpose web annotations without modifying the browser. In Sidana, a "redirector" is situated between a client browser and a server including a web document (see, Fig. 1). The redirector stores the user's annotations to the web document, so the next time the user's client browser requests the web document, the request is routed through the redirector which adds the user's previous annotations to create an augmented web document that is displayed to the user. Additionally, any URLs within the web document are modified by the redirector so that if the user selects one of the URLs the browser is routed to the redirector, which can then obtain the document corresponding to the selected URL and display to the user any of the user's previously entered annotations for that new document. See, col. 4, lines 57-67, and col. 1, line 55 – col. 2, line 32.

With respect to **claim 1**, claim 1 includes:

an annotation server, coupled to the client computer, to . . .
generate new annotations based on electronic mail
messages received both in response to the sent electronic mail
messages and not in response to the sent electronic mail
messages,

Thus, following this language, the annotation server is to generate new annotations in two ways: one way is based on electronic mail messages received in response to the sent electronic mail messages, and the second way is based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages. Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure or suggestion of generating new annotations based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages as claimed in claim 1.

The January 17 Office Action cites several portions of Hou and asserts that these portions teach generating a new annotation based on electronic mail messages received both in response to the sent electronic mail message and not in response to the sent electronic mail messages (see, ¶ 9, p. 9). Applicant respectfully disagrees. These cited portions discuss e-mail, a mail report handler that generates an e-mail message for delivery, static and dynamic annotation handlers, sending a report via an e-mail system, and replying to a report. Applicant respectfully submits, however, that none of these cited portions (or any other portion of Hou) discloses or suggests generating new annotations based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages as claimed in claim 1.

Hou does disclose that the annotation on annotation handler allows a user to select a desired segment of an annotation and make a new annotation which is a reply to this selected segment (see, col. 9, lines 14-24). However, this annotation on annotation handler allows a new annotation to be made that is a reply to a selected segment – nowhere does Hou disclose that this annotation on annotation handler can generate new annotations based on electronic mail messages received not in response to the sent electronic mail messages as claimed in claim 1.

The manner in which annotations are created in Hou can be seen in Figure 9 of Hou. As illustrated in Fig. 9, user annotation input 36 is provided to an annotation input interpreter, which forwards the input to either static annotation handler 37, annotation on annotation handler 38, or dynamic annotation handler 39. These three handlers 37, 38, and 39 allow for the addition of different annotation inputs (e.g., drawings, text, or voice) to the report 32 (see also, col. 6,

lines 26-37). After all annotations have been generated and added to report 32 by the interpreter 24 and handlers 37, 38, and 39, mail report handler can generate an e-mail message for delivery (see also, col. 6, lines 14-16). Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hou discloses generation of an e-mail message for delivery based on a report in which annotations are added to the report by other handlers (not by the mail report handler). Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere does Hou disclose or suggest mail messages from the mail report handler 27 that are not in response to other sent electronic mail messages being the basis for generating new annotations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana is not cited as curing the above-referenced deficiencies of Hou, and furthermore that Sidana does not cure the above-referenced deficiencies of Hou. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 13**, claim 13 includes:

generating an electronic mail message including . . .
an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered;

Claim 13 stands rejected under the combination of Hou and Sidana. However, the January 17 Office Action states that Hou and Sidana do not teach an installation option (see, ¶4, p. 6), which is included claim 13. Russell is asserted in the January 17 Office Action as disclosing an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered (see, ¶4, p. 6).

Presumably, claim 13 was intended to be rejected under the combination of Hou, Sidana, Goodhand, and Russell. As discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Goodhand patent is not a useable prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the subject application.

However, for the sake of argument, Applicant respectfully submits that Russell does not disclose or suggest generating an electronic mail message including an installation option as claimed in claim 13. Russell is directed to a method and apparatus for recording, categorizing, organizing, managing and retrieving speech information (see, col. 6, lines 40-42). Russell discusses obtaining a speech stream, storing the speech stream, and providing a visual representation of a portion of the speech stream to a user (see, col. 6, lines 43-53).

In the January 17 Office Action it was asserted that Russell discloses (at col 16/lines 47-col 19/line 35) an installation option that identifies an installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered (see, ¶4, p. 6). Applicant respectfully submits that neither this cited portion of Russell nor any other portion of Russell discloses or suggests an electronic mail message including an installation option as claimed in claim 13. The cited portion of Russell discusses various sub-programs executed by an application system or operating system within a personal computer (see, col. 16, lines 47-49). These include, for example, device drivers selectively loaded when the PC is configured (see, col. 16, lines 53-54), a Loop DLL (see, col. 16, line 63 – col. 17, line 1), and three executable subprograms (see, col. 17, lines 1-6). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that none of these various sub-programs in Russell disclose or suggest an installation option that identifies an

installation program that can be used to install one or more modules allowing the content and corresponding media content to be rendered, much less an electronic mail message including such an installation option, as claimed in claim 13.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Russell does not cure the deficiencies of Hou, and that claim 13 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 25**, in the January 17 Office Action it was asserted that Hou teaches (at col 6/lines 61-66, col 7/lines 1-3, col 8/line 61-63, and col 9), an identifier of a temporal range of the media content that the new annotation content is associated with, which corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message (see, ¶3, p. 2). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 25 includes:

a module to generate an electronic mail message regarding the new annotation, the electronic mail message including . . .

an identifier of a temporal range of the media content that the new annotation content is associated with, which corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message.

Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in Hou is there a discussion or suggestion of an identifier that corresponds to a location after the beginning of the media content at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to

selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message as claimed in claim 25.

The cited portions of Hou discuss annotations and annotation-related events (including time), as well as markers on a timeline indicating when actions were performed (e.g., when a mouse pointer is located at the same data object or no data object, when the individual is using the mouse pointer to draw lines, and when the individual is using the mouse pointer to gesture). However, Applicant respectfully submits that none of these events or markers disclose or suggest an electronic mail message including an identifier of a temporal range of the media content as claimed in claim 25. The identifier of the temporal range in claim 25 corresponds to a location of the media content that is after the beginning of the media content and at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message, whereas the markers and events in Hou simply identify markers of particular events and times for those events – nothing in Hou discloses or suggests beginning playback of media content at one of these markers or events upon selection of an identifier of media content corresponding to an annotation in an electronic mail message. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Hou that any of the events or markers discussed in Hou correspond to a location after the beginning of the media content at which rendering of the media content should begin in response to selection of the identifier of the media content in the electronic mail message as claimed in claim 25.

Applicant respectfully submits that Sidana is not cited as curing the above-referenced deficiencies of Hou, and furthermore that Sidana does not cure the

above-referenced deficiencies of Hou. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 25 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 31**, claim 31 includes:

including, in the reply, an identifier of one or more annotation sets that the new annotation is associated with; and
displaying a default recipient, corresponding to the identified one or more annotation sets, that is to receive an electronic mail notification of the new annotation.

Claim 31 stands rejected under the combination of Hou and Sidana. However, the January 17 Office Action does not identify any portion of either Hou or Sidana that discloses a default recipient, corresponding to the identified one or more annotation sets, that is to receive an electronic mail notification of the new annotation, as claimed in claim 31. On the other hand, the January 17 Office Action does state (see, ¶3, p. 4) that Goodhand discloses displaying a default, corresponding to the identified one or more annotation sets, that is to receive an electronic mail notification of the new annotation. Presumably, claim 13 was intended to be rejected under the combination of Hou, Sidana, and Goodhand. As discussed above, however, Applicant respectfully submits that the Goodhand patent is not a useable prior art reference under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for the subject application.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Hou and Sidana do not disclose or suggest the method of claim 31, and that claim 31 is allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 37**, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 31, Hou and Sidana do not disclose or

suggest receiving an electronic mail message that is not in reply to a previous electronic mail message, and extracting both annotation content and annotation identification information from the electronic mail message as claimed in claim 37. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 37 is allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons.

With respect to **claims 2-5, 14-16, 27-30, 32, and 38-39**, given that claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, claims 14-16 depend from claim 13, claims 27-30 depend from claim 25, claim 32 depends from claim 31, and claims 38-39 depend from claim 37, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-5, 14-16, 27-30, 32, and 38-39 are likewise allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their corresponding independent claims.

Claims 6, 8-12, 17-24, 33, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hou in view of Sidana, U.S. Patent No. 5,923,848 to Goodhand et al. (hereinafter "Goodhand"), and U.S. Patent No. 5,526,407 to Russell et al. (hereinafter "Russell"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6, 8-12, 17-24, 33, and 35-36 are not obvious over Hou in view of Sidana, Goodhand, and Russell.

With respect to **claim 6**, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 1, Hou and Sidana do not disclose or suggest "communicating, as an electronic mail message that is not in reply to another electronic mail message, the new annotation to an annotation server" as claimed in claim 6. Applicant respectfully submit that Goodhand and Russell are not cited as curing this deficiency of Hou and Sidana, and that Goodhand and Russell do not cure this deficiency of Hou and Sidana. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that

claim 1 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana, Goodhand, and Russell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 17**, Applicant respectfully submits that, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 25, Hou and Sidana do not disclose or suggest "receiving an electronic mail notification of a new annotation corresponding to media content, the new annotation corresponding to one of a plurality of temporal segments after the beginning of the media content" and "accessing, upon receiving the user input, a media server to stream, for rendering to the user, the media content beginning with the one of the plurality of segments that corresponds to the new annotation" as claimed in claim 17. Similarly, analogous to the discussion above regarding claim 25, Applicant respectfully submits that Hou and Sidana do not disclose or suggest "accessing, upon receiving the user selection, a media server indicated by the identifier to begin, at a point in the media content after the beginning of the media content and corresponding to the new annotation, streaming the media content for presentation to the user" as claimed in **claim 23**. Applicant respectfully submits that Goodhand and Russell are not cited as curing these deficiencies of Hou and Sidana, and that Goodhand and Russell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou and Sidana. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 17 and 23 are allowable over Hou in view of Sidana, Goodhand, and Russell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to **claim 33**, Hou is cited in the January 17 Office Action as disclosing creating a plurality of annotations from the plurality of electronic mail messages in the electronic mail thread (see, ¶ 11, p. 10). Applicant respectfully disagrees. In the method of claim 33, a plurality of annotations are created from

the plurality of electronic mail messages in the single electronic mail thread and added to an annotation database. Although Hou and Sidana discuss annotations, and Hou discusses adding annotations to a report, Applicant respectfully submits that nowhere in those discussions is there a disclosure or suggestion to create multiple annotations from a single electronic mail thread as claimed in amended claim 33. Applicant respectfully submits that Goodhand and Russell do not cure these deficiencies of Hou and Sidana. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 33 is allowable over Hou in view of Sidana, Goodhand, and Russell for at least the reasons discussed above.

With respect to claims 8-12, 18-22, 24, and 35-36, given that claims 8-12 depend from claim 6, claims 18-22 depend from claim 17, claim 24 depends from claim 23, and claims 35-36 depend from claim 33, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 8-12, 18-22, 24, and 35-36 are likewise allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to their corresponding independent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejections be withdrawn.

Version of Claims with Markings to Show Changes Made

8. (Twice Amended) A method as recited in claim 6, further comprising including, in the electronic mail message, an indication of one of a plurality of annotation sets, the one ~~an~~ annotation set corresponding to the media content and to the new annotation.

31. (Twice Amended) A method comprising:

receiving an electronic mail notification of an annotation corresponding to media content;

replying to the electronic mail notification to generate a new annotation corresponding to the media content;

including, in the reply, an identifier of one or more annotation sets of a plurality of annotation sets that the new annotation is associated with; and

displaying a default recipient, corresponding to the identified one or more annotation sets, that is to receive an electronic mail notification of the new annotation.

39. (Twice Amended) One or more computer-readable media as recited in claim 37, wherein the extracting annotation identification information comprises extracting from the email message:

an identifier of media content to which the annotation content corresponds and of a temporal segment, corresponding to the annotation content, of the media content; and

an identifier of an annotation set that a new annotation including the extracted annotation content is to be part of, wherein the annotation set is one of a plurality of one or more annotation sets corresponding to categories for annotations.

Conclusion

Claims 1-6, 8-25, 27-33, and 35-39 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the subject application. Should any matter in this case remain unresolved, the undersigned attorney respectfully requests a telephone conference with the Examiner to resolve any such outstanding matter.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date:

April 12, 2001

By:

Allan T. Sponseller
Reg. No. 38,318
(509) 324-9256